

Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

Executive Committee Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports

11-15-2012

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, November 15, 2012

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, November 15, 2012" (2012). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 20.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/20

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Minutes
Executive Committee Meeting
November 15, 2012

In attendance: Joan Davison, Claire Strom, Ben Varnum, Dan Crozier, Jill Jones, Dexter Boniface, Paul Reich, Bob Smither and Carol Bresnahan.

- I. Call to Order. The meeting is called to order at 12:32pm.
- II. Approve the Minutes from the last Executive Committee meeting. The minutes from October 18, 2012 are approved.
- III. New Business
 - a. F&S: Travel Allowance Proposal. Paul Reich reviews the research conducted by the F&S committee. The Finance and Services Committee voted on November 6, 2012, to recommend that individual faculty travel allocations for trips to conferences be increased from \$1200 domestic and \$1500 international to \$2000 domestic and \$2500 international. In order to ensure that funds are available for this increased allowance to individuals, the committee also recommends that the overall budget supporting faculty travel to conferences be increased to \$350,000 (from its current level of about \$187,000). The reasons for this recommendation are as follows: the above-indicated amounts of \$1200 and \$1500 were established in 1992 and inflation since then makes \$2000 and \$2500 in current dollars roughly equivalent to those 1992 figures. The 1992 faculty travel policy was intended to support two trips (although the second trip would not be fully covered) and, when new faculty members are hired, support for two trips is listed as a benefit. Yet, given inflation, neither \$1200 nor \$1500 can today support more than a single trip. Over the past five years, about 170 faculty trips to conferences have been paid for with the funds allotted for this purpose. If this rate continues, the available funds will have to be augmented up to about \$350,000 to cover the expenses at the levels the committee is recommending. F&S hopes the Executive Committee will support the Finance and Service Committee's recommendation. Paul Reich raises a procedural question:

does this proposal need to become before the faculty at large, or can it be forwarded directly to the Dean of A&S and, ultimately, the Budget and Planning committee. Carol Bresnahan states that there is no need to bring this before the faculty since they would surely endorse an increase in the travel allowance. Paul Reich suggests that this should be done quickly in anticipation of the Board meeting in February 2013. The EC endorses the proposal.

- b. AAC Proposed Catalog Change. AAC proposes to insert the following after “Minor Requirements” in “Curriculum and Curricular Requirements” Section of Catalog: *“Double Counting of Classes for Majors and Minors. If students are enrolled in more than one major or minor, they may double count no more than half the number of courses in the smaller program. If the smaller program requires an odd number of courses, the student may round up.”* Claire Strom explains the rationale for the proposed change. Joan Davison states that she opposes the proposal. She believes that students should be able to double-count any class across majors and minors. She states that, particularly in light of the fact that Rollins is moving toward a system of dual degree programs; we should not restrict double-counting classes if we are double-counting degrees. Carol Bresnahan asks what the concern of the committee is—are students “gaming the system” in terms of double-counting across multiple majors. Claire states that AAC should maintain its rigor regardless of what happens with respect to dual degree programs. She does not believe it is desirable for students to get two major degrees with only thirteen classes. Dexter Boniface explains his reasons for supporting the proposal, namely that it will not have a large impact on current practices and will create clarity for students and programs. Claire states that she thinks this is a good idea because prior to the proposal, there simply was not an explicit policy. Joan asks what happens with respect to, say, International Business where many INB students get a minor in a foreign language. Claire states that this might entail taking three more classes. This might only be a problem with Chinese where so few courses are offered. Joan goes back to the philosophical issue: why should one student have to do more when they have the exact same courses? Carol asks if the committee talked about the implication of reducing the credit load from 140 to 128. Claire states that the Gen. Ed. requirements are also decreasing, so this should not change things in terms of majors and minors. Bob Smither asks if CPS and A&S students would have the same

requirements in earning a minor in foreign language. The motion passes with one vote opposed.

- c. AAC: Gen Ed Omnibus. Claire presents a proposal to address the issue of incorporating CPS departments into the divisional structure of the new General Education system. The first part of the proposal (“Determining Division”) enables CPS to offer Gen. Ed. classes (and it also enables A&S faculty to, potentially, teach classes in another division). Joan asks about the phrase “experimental data on the natural world.” She notes that social sciences also use experimental data; for example, in Political Science and Psychology. Bob Smither asks if the word “natural world” implies ‘sciences.’ Claire says that this was the language favored by the science faculty on the committee. The second part of AAC’s proposal concerns the role of the Social Sciences. Historically, Claire notes, the Social Science division has contributed the most number of courses to the General Education system. Under the new system, the Social Science division will offer considerably fewer classes (especially if CPS faculty members are going to teach classes in the Social Sciences division). Joan states that this seems like a lot of effort to incorporate faculty (the CPS) that willingly left the A&S faculty and do not teach many Gen Ed classes to begin with. Claire states that this document presents a compromise; if we do not pass this (and maintain a strict divisional structure exclusive to A&S), then this could alienate faculty members in CPS. Bob Smither asks if this potential alienation is a widespread sentiment in CPS; he states that he has not heard that many CPS faculty members are concerned about the issue. Claire states that the current proposal is inclusive of those CPS faculty members (probably not a large group) that would like to contribute to Gen Eds. Jill Jones asks Claire her personal opinion. Claire states that this proposal avoids a struggle that A&S does not have to have with the CPS. The one key concern she has is with respect to the Social Sciences. Ben Varnum asks what impact this would have on students; is this mostly an administrative issue, or would it impact student majors. Claire says it would not have any obvious impact. Joan states that there are implications for departments and majors; for instance, Sociology has few classes outside the Gen Ed system and the new Gen Ed system could be a challenge for their department in terms of maintaining enrollments. Jill asks how we should proceed. Joan suggests that we forward this document to the A&S faculty without making an endorsement; the committee agrees. Ben states that he is very concerned about the implications for students of the new Gen. Ed. system. He notes

that the bigger change in the Gen Ed system places more onus on individual faculty to bring the spirit of a classical liberal arts perspective into their disciplinary classes given that the overall structure of requirements will be reduced.

- d. AAC: Bylaw Change (see attached): The proposal would add the following language to the bylaws: "*The Vice President/Secretary shall also be responsible for maintaining the definitive copy of the A&S bylaws and evidence of all changes.*" The motion passes.
- e. PSC: Grant Award changes. PSC completed reviewing grant applications from faculty members on sabbatical in 2012-2014. Recommendations have been sent to the Dean. PSC did have two general comments regarding grants. First, PSC is opposed to some of the current limitations on expenditures, and believes faculty members should be able to request (and spend if awarded) funds on any line which a faculty member can justify. PSC worries the restriction on certain expenditures might lead to a bias against certain types of research or disciplines. Second, PSC is concerned that some faculty members have received as much as \$30,000 in grant dollars from Rollins. PSC believes that rather than the current rule (which states that when a faculty member receives three consecutive years of funds then he/she must skip an application years) should be changed to limit total dollars awarded. The policy would limit a faculty member to \$20,000 across 7 years (so it would restart after a sabbatical year). PSC notes it seems unfair to perhaps award one individual \$5000 a year for three consecutive years (total \$15,000) and another individual \$500 a year for three consecutive years (total \$1,500) and then treat both 'equally' and claim neither can apply in the fourth year. PSC believes it is fairer to set a limit based on total dollars received in a time period. Claire states that she would support a proposal like this as long as it regulates only those grants that are within the purview of PSC (i.e., does not include McKean, Cornell awards etc.). Finally, PSC would like to include a new policy which requires applications to outside grant agencies. PSC believes faculty members should demonstrate some record (even if unsuccessful) of attempting to receive outside grants before Rollins awards them multiple times, particularly for the same project. PSC seeks EC's input on these policy changes before adopting them, and seeks EC assent to change the terms on grants. Dexter Boniface states that he opposes the last policy change regarding outside grants. He does not believe it is in the spirit of the Rollins summer grants programs; for

example, it is important that junior faculty have access to internal grant funds. Claire agrees. Joan adds that another issue is whether or not grant money could be used to pay students or buy equipment. Joan suggests a policy whereby you could plea for a budget item that has not traditionally been allowed. After further deliberation, the committee determines that these changes are within the purview of PSC. Bob Smither states that he commends AAC and PSC for the fantastic work they have done on these important business items.

- f. The meeting is adjourned.
- g. Note: the following items of New Business were not discussed:
 - a. PSC: 5 PLUS.
 - b. Change to the Mission Statement of the All Faculty Bylaws.

IV. Committee Reports (submitted by email)

1. PSC. At its November 13, 2012 meeting, PSC addressed the 5 PLUS to determine what would constitute a PLUS. PSC agreed upon the following: CE courses; RCC; Neighborhood courses (but not W, F, Q although these were debated; PSC ultimately the Neighborhood courses required integrated learning, theme activities, incorporation of appropriate LEAP outcomes, and assessment); Student Trips (domestic or international); Tutorials, Independent Studies and Honor Theses exceeding 4/year; Field Studies not currently counted (the committee was aware of current special status for Marine Biology and Environmental Science). PSC decided that each faculty member would earn either the 5+ or \$3500 after teaching in any one of these categories, but each faculty member could only receive the 5+ or the \$3500. PSC agreed that current stipends for the RCC would be eliminated. PSC appreciated some faculty members might benefit more from this system than other faculty members, but agreed no faculty member would fare worse. The question was raised regarding how performance labs would be counted in faculty load. The Honors Program was discussed, and PSC concluded that at this time teaching in the Honors Program would not be treated as a PLUS because 1) unlike CE, RCC and the Neighborhood, there is no reason to believe that teaching in the Honors Program is more demanding than teaching a regular course, 2) at the present time there does not seem to be

any difficulty in attracting faculty members to teach in the Honors Program, and 3) unlike RCC and CE, there is no open call for all faculty members to participate in the Honors Program. PSC agreed that a PLUS would not be awarded for team teaching given the generally weak course reviews for team teaching. PSC recognized it could not resolve every possibility, but did agree that the 5+ only applies to tenured and tenure track faculty members. PSC reasoned that lecturers are separately contracted to specific teaching tasks. PSC further concluded (although less comfortably) that this also is true regarding visiting faculty members and artists-in-residence. PSC reports, furthermore, that it met with David Richards to discuss his idea of converting some Holt adjunct positions to contracted lecturers; he estimates creating 8-10 lecturers (teaching a 4-2-4) to stabilize Holt offerings and improve the quality of the Holt faculty. PSC expressed concern about financial issues, but focused upon professional issues with such a proposal. The lecturers would be located in and evaluated by departments, therefore, PSC felt the lecturers should be hired through a national search. PSC worried about the creation of a caste system within departments. PSC also questioned the evaluation process, which would seem to focus solely on teaching. The sentiment was a department would evaluate a lecturer on teaching and then send that evaluation to the A&S Dean, since lecturers would be A&S faculty. The A&S Dean would share the department's recommendation with the Holt dean, and together they would make a final evaluation of the lecturer. Other problems discussed were that in the absence of cost of living or across the board increases, lecturers currently are not included in merit pay - there is no process for a lecturer's salary adjustment. Another question involved for what type of grants and travel funds that would qualify. The student reps on PSC expressed concerns about lecturers, commenting they avoid adjuncts and lecturers, and understand a difference usually exists. One student rep on PSC is a work study student in English and she noted a type of hierarchy exists, and this is uncomfortable. PSC faculty members worried about this situation as well as whether the number of lecturers would slowly increase, perhaps replacing tenure track members. PSC emphasized to Dean Richards that he should have a discussion with department chairs to elicit their concerns.

2. SLC. The only agenda item that the SLC has for the EC is the language issue in the Faculty Handbook regarding the location of the procedural directions for students filing a grievance. Dan Crozier reports that he

found the location in the Handbook where the language is questionable and the place in the student Code of Community Standards that addresses this issue. It is likely a quick fix, but if EC's agenda is too full this week we can wait to deal with this until the next meeting. At its November 6, 2012 meeting, SLC heard the required annual report from the Athletics Department delivered by Pennie Parker. Following this, we had a discussion about scheduling of required classes for majors. The Athletic Department hopes that required courses can be scheduled to meet between 8:00AM and 4:00PM to accommodate their practice schedules. A gradual "creep" of required A&S courses that meet past the 4:00 hour has been observed in recent years. We discussed the fact that it is probably impossible to alter either lab schedules or theater/music ensemble rehearsals much, but the required courses themselves could likely be scheduled to meet within the 8AM-4PM time frame. Departments that rely heavily on adjunct faculty could face some difficulties. The SLC is sympathetic to this issue and has decided to take it to the next Department Chairs meeting since they are directly responsible for setting class schedules within academic majors. We ended the meeting with the review of our first SHIP grant application. Since the application materials are not yet present on the VP for Student Affairs site, and the applicant was working without sufficient information, we sent the application back to the student and advisor for revisions. We have been in IT's queue for getting this done for several weeks, but were told it may be some time before it appears on the VP for Student Affairs site. In the interim, I am sending out the application to interested students via email as requests come in.